



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,225	02/17/2004	Kenji Kuwabara	P/1905-108	9481
2352 7590 09/24/2007 OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			EXAMINER WOOD, WILLIAM H	
			ART UNIT 2193	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,225

Applicant(s)

KUWABARA ET AL.

Examiner

William H. Wood

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/17/04; 5/5/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-15 are pending and have been examined.

Priority

Applicant's claim to priority is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 05 May 2006 and 17 February 2004 are considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by **Martin** (US 6,438,746 B1).

Claim 1

Martin disclosed a method of converting a software program for a single processor to a software program for a multiprocessor, comprising the steps of:

allocating a source file to each processor by an object file unit (*column 1, lines 55-62; and column 2, lines 14-38*); and

preparing an execute form program for operating software running on a single memory space on the multiprocessor for each processor (*column 1, lines 55-62; and column 2, lines 14-38*).

Claim 2

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 1, further comprising the step of:

disposing the execute form program mounted on the memory space to be managed by each processor in such a manner that addresses are prevented from being duplicated among the processors (*column 9, lines 13-16*).

Claim 3

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 1 or 2, further comprising the steps of: starting exception processing possessed by the processor which is a refer requester to detect that there occurs a refer request to variables arranged on a memory space managed by another processor during running of the execute form program; and sending the refer request to an appropriate processor, wherein the processor which has received

the refer request refers to the variables to return refer results to the refer requester, and the processor which is the refer requester emulation-executes a variable refer command from the returned results to return to the next command from the exception processing (*column 9, lines 26-33; column 10, lines 30-49*).

Claim 4

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 1 or 2, further comprising the steps of: starting exception processing possessed by the processor which is a write requester to detect that there occurs a request for write into variables arranged on a memory space managed by another processor during running of the execute form program; and sending the write request to an appropriate processor, wherein the processor which has received the write request writes the variables, and the processor which is the write requester returns to the next command from the exception processing (*column 9, lines 26-33; column 10, lines 30-49*).

Claim 5

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 1 or 2, further comprising the steps of: starting exception processing possessed

by the processor which is a write requester to detect that there occurs a request for write into variables arranged on a memory space managed by another processor during running of the execute form program; and sending the write request to an appropriate processor, wherein the processor which has received the write request writes the variables to return write results to the write requester, and the processor which is the write requester returns to the next command from the exception processing (*column 9, lines 26-33; column 10, lines 30-49*).

Claim 6

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 1 or 2, further comprising the steps of: starting exception processing possessed by the processor which is a call requester to detect that there occurs a call request for functions arranged on a memory space managed by another processor during running of the execute form program; and sending the call request to an appropriate processor, wherein the processor which has received the call request calls the functions to return call results to the call requester, and the processor which is the call requester emulation-executes a function call command from the returned results to return to the next command from the exception processing (*column 9, lines 26-33; column 10, lines 30-49; column 7, lines 12-26, "call" object*).

Claim 7

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 3, further comprising: communication between the processors in which communication including processing request transmission and processing result return via the exception processing is possible (*column 11, lines 40-41*).

Claim 8

Martin disclosed a cellular phone in which the software program for the multiprocessor converted by the method according to claim 1 is installed (*column 3, line 42*).

Claim 9

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 4, further comprising: communication between the processors in which communication including processing request transmission and processing result return via the exception processing is possible (*column 11, lines 40-41*).

Claim 10

Martin disclosed the method of converting the software program for the single

processor to the software program for the multiprocessor according to claim 5, further comprising: communication between the processors in which communication including processing request transmission and processing result return via the exception processing is possible (*column 11, lines 40-41*).

Claims 11-15

Martin disclosed a cellular phone in which the software program for the multiprocessor converted by the method according to claim 2 is installed (*column 3, line 42*).

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William H. Wood whose telephone number is (571)-272-3736. The examiner can normally be reached 10:00am - 4:00pm Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)-272-3756. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571)273-8300 for regular communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR systems, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. For questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.



William H. Wood
Patent Examiner
AU 2193

September 16, 2007